

Testing for arbitrary interference on experimentation platforms*

Jean Pouget-Abadie[†], Martin Saveski[‡], Guillaume Saint-Jacques[‡],
 Weitao Duan[§], Ya Xu[§], Souvik Ghosh[§], Edoardo M. Airolidi[†]

[†] Harvard University, [‡] MIT, [§] LinkedIn

Abstract

Experimentation platforms are essential components of modern large IT companies, as they are used to carry out a large number of randomized experiments daily. On such platforms, the classic assumption of no interference among users—that is, the fact that the outcome of a user does not depend on the treatment assigned to other users—is rarely tenable. Here, we introduce an experimental design strategy for testing whether this assumption holds. Our approach is in the spirit of the Durbin-Wu-Hausman test for endogeneity in econometrics, where multiple estimators return the same estimate if and only if the null hypothesis holds. The design that we introduce makes no assumptions on the interference model between units, nor on the network among the units, and comes with a sharp bound on the variance, and an implied analytical bound on the type I error rate. The idea is to obtain two different estimates of the total treatment effect leveraging two randomization strategies—namely, complete randomization and cluster-based randomization—and to analyze the distribution of their difference. We propose a multilevel assignment strategy for obtaining these two estimates simultaneously, and we develop theoretical guarantees for rejecting the null hypothesis that no interference holds, regardless of the type of interference. We discuss how to apply the proposed design strategy to large experimentation platforms, and we illustrate it in the context of a live experiment on the LinkedIn experimentation platform.

Keywords: Causal inference; Potential outcomes, Arbitrary interference; Violations of SUTVA.

*Jean Pouget-Abadie and Martin Saveski contributed equally to this work. The majority of the work was done while Martin Saveski and Guillaume Saint-Jacques were interns at LinkedIn, Mountain View.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Methodology	2
2.1	Complete randomization and cluster-based randomization	2
2.2	A randomization strategy over randomization strategies	3
2.3	Remarks	5
2.3.1	Stratification to achieve covariate balance	5
2.3.2	Simultaneous experiments and subsampling	6
3	Theory	7
3.1	Type I error guarantees	7
3.2	Variance estimators	8
3.3	Understanding the type II error rate	10
3.4	Bernoulli randomization as an alternative assignment strategy	11
4	Illustration on the LinkedIn experimentation platform	12
4.1	Experimental set-up	12
4.2	Clustering the graph	13
4.3	Stratifying the clusters	13
4.4	Experimental results	15
A	Supplementary material	19
A.1	Proof of Theorem 1	19
A.2	Proof of Corollary 1	23
A.3	Proof of Equation 5	23
A.4	Proof of Theorem 2	24
A.5	Proof of Theorem 3	24
A.6	Proof of Theorem 4	25
A.7	Proof of Theorem 5	27
A.8	Proof of Lemma 1	28

1 Introduction

Applications of the potential outcomes approach to causal inference (Rubin, 1974; Imbens and Rubin, 2015) often rely on the assumption of no interference among the units of analysis; that is, the fact that the outcome of each unit does not depend on the treatment assigned to other units. This fact is formalized by the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA; Cox, 1958; Rubin, 1990). However, in applications where social information among the units of analysis is recorded, assuming SUTVA is often untenable, and classical results in causal inference may no longer hold true (Karwa and Airoidi, 2017). Examples of causal analyses where interference is present are numerous, including education policy (Hong and Raudenbush, 2012), viral marketing campaigns (Aral and Walker, 2011; Eckles et al., 2016), and social networks and healthcare (Shakya et al., 2017). In these examples, for instance, the difference-in-means estimator computed under Bernoulli randomization is no longer guaranteed to be an unbiased estimator of the average treatment effect (ATE).

The research community has made significant efforts to extend the theory of causal inference to scenarios where SUTVA does not hold. A popular approach to minimizing the effects of interference, cluster-based randomized designs, have been extensively studied, spanning from the early work of (Cornfield, 1978; COMMIT, 1991; Donner and Klar, 2004) to more recent contributions by (Ugander et al., 2013; Eckles et al., 2014). Multi-level designs where treatment is applied with different proportions across the population (Hudgens and Halloran, 2008; Tchetgen and VanderWeele, 2012) are also an important tenet of the literature on improving causal estimates under interference, having been applied to vaccination trials (Datta et al., 1999) and more recently voter-mobilization campaigns (Sinclair et al., 2012). More recent literature has developed around various assignment strategies and estimators, beyond cluster-based randomized design or multi-level designs with some guarantees under specific models of interference (Backstrom and Kleinberg, 2011; Katzir et al., 2012; Aronow et al., 2013; Toulis and Kao, 2013; Manski, 2013; Aronow and Samii, 2013; Choi, 2014; Basse and Airoidi, 2015; Gui et al., 2015; Sussman and Airoidi, 2017).

While dealing with interference for the purpose of estimating causal effects is often an important goal in causal inference problems where interference is due to a network, a more fundamental need is to be able to detect whether or not SUTVA holds in a given experiment. Rosenbaum (2007) was the first to formulate two sharp null hypotheses that imply SUTVA does not hold. We can obtain the exact distribution of network parameters under these restricted null hypotheses. More recent work in this vein (Aronow, 2012; Athey et al., 2015) explicitly tackles testing for the non-sharp null that SUTVA holds, by considering the

distribution of network effect parameters for a subpopulation of the graph under SUTVA.

In this paper, we introduce a multilevel experimental design strategy that allows the experimenter to test for whether SUTVA holds. This design-centric approach differs from prior work, which focuses on applying post-experiment analysis methods to classical experimental designs, such as the Fisher randomization test. Our approach is in the spirit of the Durbin-Wu-Hausman test for endogeneity in econometrics (Hausman, 1978), where multiple estimators return the same estimate if and only if the null hypothesis holds. The design that we introduce makes no assumptions on the interference model between units, nor on the network among the units, and comes with a sharp bound on the variance (under some conditions), and an implied analytical bound on the Type I error rate. Most importantly, the proposed design is non-intrusive: it allows the experimenter to analyse the experiment in a classical way, for example to conduct an analysis of the treatment effect with the standard assumptions.

In Section 2, we discuss the methodology for the experimental design. In Section 3, we provide guarantees on the Type I and II error of our suggested test. Finally, in Section 4, we present some of the results obtained for an experiment launched in August 2016 on LinkedIn’s experimentation platform using our suggested framework.

2 Methodology

2.1 Complete randomization and cluster-based randomization

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph of N units which we can assign to two possible intervention buckets: treatment ($Z_i = 1$) and control ($Z_i = 0$). Without making the SUTVA assumption, we define each unit’s potential outcome as a function of the entire assignment vector $\mathbf{Z} \in \{0, 1\}^G$ of units to treatment buckets: $Y_i(\mathbf{Z})$. The causal estimand of interest is the *Total Treatment Effect* (TTE) given by:

$$\mu := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} Y_i(\mathbf{Z} = \vec{1}) - Y_i(\mathbf{Z} = \vec{0})$$

We briefly review the notation and main results for two popular experimental designs: the completely randomized (CR) design and the cluster-based randomized (CBR) design. For any vector $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we let $\bar{u} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i$ and $\sigma^2(\vec{u}) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - \bar{u})^2$. In a *completely randomized* experiment, we sample the assignment vector $\mathbf{Z}$ uniformly at random from the

set $\{z \in \{0, 1\}^N : \sum z_i = n_t\}$, where n_t is the number of units assigned to treatment and $n_c := N - n_t$ is the number of units assigned to control. The difference-in-means estimator is defined as:

$$\hat{\mu}_{cr} := \bar{Y}_t - \bar{Y}_c,$$

where $Y_t := \{Y_i : Z_i = 1\}$ and $Y_c := \{Y_i : Z_i = 0\}$. In a *cluster-based randomized* assignment, we randomize over clusters of units in the graph, rather than individual units. We suppose that each unit in G is assigned to one of m clusters. We sample the cluster assignment vector z uniformly at random from $\{v \in \{0, 1\}^m : \sum v_i = m_t\}$, assigning units in cluster j to the corresponding treatment: $Z_i = 1 \Leftrightarrow z_j = 1$ if $i \in j$, where m_t is the number of clusters assigned to treatment and $m_c := M - m_t$ is the number of clusters assigned to control. We let Y' be the vector of *aggregated* potential outcomes, defined as $Y'_j := \sum_{i \in j} Y_i$, the sum of all outcomes within that cluster. We let Y'_t be the aggregated outcomes of the treated clusters $Y'_t := \{Y'_j : z_j = 1\}$ and Y'_c the aggregated outcomes of the control clusters $Y'_c := \{Y'_j : z_j = 0\}$. The aggregated difference-in-means estimator is given by:

$$\hat{\mu}_{cbr} := \frac{m}{N} (\bar{Y}'_t - \bar{Y}'_c).$$

When SUTVA holds, $\hat{\mu}_{cr}$ is an unbiased estimator of the total treatment effect μ under a completely randomized assignment: $E_Z[\hat{\mu}_{cr}] = \mu$. Similarly, when SUTVA holds, $\hat{\mu}_{cbr}$ is an unbiased estimator of μ under a cluster-based randomized assignment. However, when SUTVA does not hold, these results are no longer guaranteed and we expect the estimate of the total treatment effect to be different under each design when interference is present.

2.2 A randomization strategy over randomization strategies

If it were possible to apply both the completely randomized and cluster-based randomized designs, we could test for interference by comparing the two estimates from each assignment strategy: if the two estimates are significantly different, there is interference. Unfortunately, just as we cannot assign both treatment and control to each unit, we cannot apply both assignment designs on G . We solve this problem by first randomly assigning units to treatment *arms* and within each treatment arm, applying a specific assignment strategy of units to treatment *buckets*. In order to maintain some of the graph structure intact within each treatment arm without sacrificing covariate balance or introducing bias, we suggest to use a cluster-based randomized design to assign units to treatment arms. Once units are assigned to treatment arms, we suggest to apply within each treatment arm either a cluster-based




Figure 1: Suggested hierarchical assignment.

randomized design or a completely randomized design. See Figure 1 for an illustration.

We now set up the formal notation. We cluster graph G into m clusters $\mathcal{J}$. Let m_{cr} and m_{cbr} be the number of clusters we wish to assign to treatment arms cr and cbr respectively and let n_{cr} and $n_{cbr} = N - n_{cr}$ be the resulting number of units assigned to each arm. Let $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be the assignment vector of units to treatment arm cr ($W_i = 1$) and treatment arm cbr ($W_i = 0$) and let $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{J}}$ be the corresponding cluster-to-treatment-arm assignment vector. In treatment arm cr , let $n_{cr,t}$ and $n_{cr,c}$ be the number of units that we wish to assign to treatment and control respectively. In treatment arm cbr , let $m_{cbr,t}$ and $m_{cbr,c}$ be the number of clusters that we wish to assign to treatment and control respectively. Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be the assignment vector of units to treatment and control, composed of two parts $\mathbf{Z}_{cr} \in \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$ for units in treatment arm cr and $\mathbf{Z}_{cbr} \in \{0, 1\}^{n_{cbr}}$ for units in treatment arm cbr .

The hierarchical design is as follows: we (i) sample $\mathbf{W}$ in a cluster-based randomized way. Conditioned on $\mathbf{W}$, we (ii) sample $\mathbf{Z}_{cr}$ using a completely randomized assignment to assign units in treatment arm cr to treatment and control. Conditioned on $\mathbf{W}$, we (iii) sample $\mathbf{Z}_{cbr}$ using a cluster-based randomized assignment to assign units in treatment arm cbr to treatment and control. The resulting assignment vector $\mathbf{Z}$ of units to treatment and control is such that $\mathbf{Z}_{cr} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Z}_{cbr} | \mathbf{W}$.

Though we could imagine re-clustering the graph for step (iii), a simpler option from an analytical and methodological perspective is to re-use the same clustering used in step (i). We define the two estimates of the causal effect for this experiment as follows:

$$\hat{\mu}_{cr}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) := \bar{Y}_{cr,t} - \bar{Y}_{cr,c}, \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{cbr}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) := \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} (\bar{Y}'_{cbr,t} - \bar{Y}'_{cbr,c}), \quad (2)$$

where $Y_{cr,t} := \{Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 1\}$, $Y_{cr,c} := \{Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 0\}$, $Y'_{cbr,t} := \{Y'_j : \omega_j = 0 \wedge z_j = 1\}$, $Y'_{cbr,c} := \{Y'_j : \omega_j = 0 \wedge z_j = 0\}$. In the spirit of the Durbin-Hausman-Wu test, we could have chosen to compare different estimators or different designs altogether. Comparing alternative approaches to the one suggested here is left to future work.

2.3 Remarks

2.3.1 Stratification to achieve covariate balance

If the chosen number of clusters is small, we run the risk of having strong covariate imbalances in the sampled treatment arm assignment vector $\mathbf{W}$. In this case, we recommend using a stratified treatment arm assignment. Suppose that each graph cluster $j \in \mathcal{J}$ is assigned to one of S strata. We let $G(s)$ be the nodes in the graph which belong to strata s . Within each strata $s \in [1, S]$, we assign $m_{cr}(s)$ clusters completely at random to treatment arm cr and $m_{cbr}(s)$ clusters to treatment arm 2, denoted by vector $\mathbf{W}(s)$, sampled uniformly at random from vectors $\{\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{G(s)} : \sum_j v_j = m_{cr}(s)\}$.

Let $\mathbf{Z}_{cr}(s)$ be the assignment of units in treatment arm cr to treatment buckets within strata s . If $G_{cr}(s)$ is the subgraph of G in strata s assigned to treatment arm cr , $\mathbf{Z}_{cr}(s)$ is chosen uniformly at random from the vectors $\{\vec{u} \in \{0, 1\}^{G_{cr}(s)} : \sum_i u_i = n_{cr,t}(s)\}$. Similarly, let $z_{cbr}(s)$ be the assignment of clusters in treatment arm cbr to the treatment buckets within strata s . If $\mathcal{J}_{cbr}(s)$ is the subset of clusters in strata s assigned to treatment arm cbr , $z_{cbr}(s)$ is chosen uniformly at random from the vectors $\{\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{J}_{cbr}(s)} : \sum_j v_j = m_{cbr,t}(s)\}$.

Let $n_{cbr}(s)$ be the total number of units assigned to treatment arm 2 and $m_{cbr}(s)$ be the total number of clusters assigned to treatment arm cbr within strata s . We can extend the previous estimators of the average treatment effect under stratification. Let $Y_{cr,t}(s) := \{Y_i : Z_i = 1 \wedge i \in G_{cr}(s)\}$, $Y_{cr,c}(s) := \{Y_i : Z_i = 0 \wedge i \in G_{cr}(s)\}$, $Y'_{cbr,t}(s) := \{Y'_j : z_j = 1 \wedge j \in \mathcal{J}_{cbr}(s)\}$ and $Y'_{cbr,c}(s) := \{Y'_j : z_j = 0 \wedge j \in \mathcal{J}_{cbr}(s)\}$. The stratified estimators are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_{cr}(s) &:= \overline{Y_{cr,t}(s)} - \overline{Y_{cr,c}(s)} \\ \hat{\mu}_{cbr}(s) &:= \frac{m_{cbr}(s)}{n_{cbr}(s)} \left(\overline{Y'_{cbr,t}(s)} - \overline{Y'_{cbr,c}(s)} \right)\end{aligned}$$

We can therefore define the stratified Δ estimator as follows:

$$\Delta(s) := \hat{\mu}_{cr}(s) - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}(s)$$

The overall Δ estimator can be expressed as an appropriately weighted average of the $\Delta(s)$:

$$\Delta := \sum_{s \in [1, S]} \frac{m(s)}{M} \Delta(s)$$

As we will see in Section 3, it is necessary to consider the variance of our difference-in-difference-in-means estimator. For a given empirical upper-bound $\hat{\sigma}^2(s)$ of $\text{var}_{\mathbf{W}(s), \mathbf{Z}(s)}[\Delta(s)]$, we define an empirical upper-bound $\hat{\sigma}^2$:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 := \sum_{s \in [1, S]} \left(\frac{m(s)}{M} \right)^2 \hat{\sigma}^2(s)$$

Corollary 1 still holds with the above definitions. See Section 3 for more details.

2.3.2 Simultaneous experiments and subsampling

Online experimentation platforms often need to run multiple experiments simultaneously. They also regularly change the treatment assignment of their users as products get rolled out or replaced. As a result, the population of interest is randomly divided up into *segments*. When an experiment launches, a segment of the population is chosen at random to be assigned to treatment or control, leaving the units in other segments available for other experiments. In other words, there is a default layer of randomization $\mathbf{X}$ which decides which units are included in experiment. Since this subsampling might negatively impact the effect of the cluster-based randomization, we decided against subsampling in the cluster-

based randomization arm.

Formally, we begin by sampling $\mathbf{W}$ in a cluster-based randomized way to assign units to treatment arms. For the units assigned to treatment arm cr , we sample $\mathbf{X}$ uniformly at random from all vectors in $\{0, 1\}^{n_{cr}}$. We assign units such that $W_i = X_i = 1$ to treatment using a Bernoulli randomized assignment (cf. Section 3.4). For units assigned to the cbr treatment arm, we directly sample the vector z to assign clusters in $\mathcal{J}_{cbr}$ to their treatment bucket, without a subsampling step. We redefine $Y_{cr,t} := \{Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge X_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 1\}$, $Y_{cr,c} := \{Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge X_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 0\}$, $\hat{S}_{1,t} := \sigma^2(Y_{cr,t})$, and $\hat{S}_{cr,c} := \sigma^2(Y_{cr,c})$. We let $n_{cr,t}$ and $n_{cr,c}$ be the number of units assigned to treatment and control in treatment arm cr post-subsampling. Taking into account these new definitions, the results of Section 3 still hold.

3 Theory

3.1 Type I error guarantees

If SUTVA does not hold, the moments of $\hat{\mu}_{cr}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{cbr}$ (cf. Eq. 1–2) are unknown without specifying a model of interference. However, assuming that n_{cr} , n_{cbr} , $n_{cr,t}$, $n_{cr,c}$, $m_{cbr,t}$ and $m_{cbr,c}$ are constants and not random variables, we can easily compute the first and second-order moment of each estimator under SUTVA. Thus, we require the clustering of the graph to be balanced such that for any cluster $j \in \mathcal{J}$, $|j| = \frac{N}{M} = \frac{n_{cr}}{m_{cr}} = \frac{n_{cbr}}{m_{cbr}}$. Under this assumption, the following theorem holds:

Theorem 1. *If SUTVA holds, the first and second order moments of the difference-in-difference-in-means estimator are given by:*

$$E_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{cr} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}] = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} var_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{cr} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}] = & \lambda_1 \cdot \left(\frac{S_1}{n_{cr,t}} + \frac{S_0}{n_{cr,c}} - \frac{S_{10}}{n_{cr}} \right) + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{S'_1}{m_{cbr,t}} + \frac{S'_0}{m_{cbr,c}} - \frac{S'_{10}}{m_{cbr}} \right) \\ & + \frac{M}{n_{cr}n_{cbr}} S'_{10} + \lambda_2 \cdot \left(\frac{\overline{Y^2(1)}}{n_{cr,t}} + \frac{\overline{Y^2(0)}}{n_{cr,c}} - \frac{\overline{(Y(1) - Y(0))^2}}{n_{cr}} \right) \\ & - \lambda_2 \cdot \frac{m_{cr}m_{cbr}}{n_{cr}n_{cbr}} \cdot \left(\frac{\overline{(Y')^2(1)}}{n_{cr,t}} + \frac{\overline{(Y')^2(0)}}{n_{cr,c}} - \frac{\overline{(Y'(1) - Y'(0))^2}}{n_{cr}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we let $S_1 := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) : i \in G)$ and $S_0 := \sigma^2(Y_i(0) : i \in G)$ be the variance of the

potential outcomes and let $S_{10} := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) : i \in G)$ be the variance of the difference in potential outcomes. Similarly, we defined the variance of the aggregated potential outcomes: $S'_1 := \sigma^2(Y'_j(1) : j \in \mathcal{J})$ and $S'_0 := \sigma^2(Y_j(0) : j \in \mathcal{J})$, as well as the difference in aggregated potential outcomes: $S'_{10} := \sigma^2(Y_j(1) - Y_j(0) : j \in \mathcal{J})$. Furthermore, let $\overline{Y^2(1)} := \overline{(Y_i^2(1))}_{i \in G}$, $\overline{(Y')^2(1)} := \overline{(Y'_j(1)^2)}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$, $\overline{Y^2(0)} := \overline{(Y_i^2(0))}_{i \in G}$ and $\overline{(Y')^2(0)} := \overline{(Y'_j(0)^2)}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$. Finally, let $\lambda_1 := \frac{N-1}{N} \frac{n_{cr}}{n_{cr}-1} \frac{M}{M-1}$ and $\lambda_2 := \frac{n_{cr}n_{cbr}}{n_{cr}(n_{cr}-1)(M-1)}$.

Note that $\lambda_1 \approx 1$ and that $\lambda_2 \ll \lambda_1$. The following corollary is a direct application of Chebyshev's inequality.

Corollary 1. *Let $\hat{\sigma}^2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be any computable quantity from the experimental data which upper-bounds the true variance: $\hat{\sigma}^2 \geq \text{var}_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}[\Delta]$. Suppose that we reject the null if and only if:*

$$\frac{|\hat{\mu}_{cr} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}|}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}.$$

Then if SUTVA holds, we reject the null (incorrectly) with probability no greater than α .

A proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 is included in the supplementary material. Note that this results hold for any clustering, for any graph, and for any model of interference. This is not surprising because the theorem states a result on the Type I error of our test, under which we can assume SUTVA. Another way of rejecting the null is to approximate the test statistic $T := \frac{\hat{\mu}_{cr} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2}}$ by a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. In this case we obtain the following conservative $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ confidence intervals:

$$CI^{1-\alpha}(T) = (T - z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, T + z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}})$$

where $z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ and $z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ are the $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

3.2 Variance estimators

The main assumption made in Corollary 1 is that the quantity $\hat{\sigma}^2$, computable from observable data, is an upper-bound of the unknown theoretical variance of our estimator σ^2 . In this section, we discuss solutions to finding the smallest possible upper-bound $\hat{\sigma}^2$ of the theoretical variance.

One common quantity studied in the causal inference literature is the variance assuming Fisher's Null hypothesis of no treatment effect: $\forall i, Y_i(1) = Y_i(0)$. Note that Fisher's Null states that each units potential outcome under all treatment assignment is the same, which

implies the null hypothesis that SUTVA holds, but the converse is not true (Rosenbaum, 2007). However, it is sometimes reasonable to assume that the variance of our estimator under Fisher's null is a good proxy for the theoretical variance under SUTVA. For example, for a completely randomized assignment and treatment effect given by $Y_i(1) = (1 + \rho)Y_i(0) + \epsilon_i$, where $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \kappa^2) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_i(0)$, then

$$\frac{var_1 - var_0}{var_0} = (2\rho + \rho^2) \frac{N_c}{N} + \frac{\kappa^2}{S} \left(\frac{N_c}{N} \right)^2. \quad (5)$$

In other words, for a small treatment effect $\rho = 5\%$, $\kappa^2 \ll S$ and $\frac{N_c}{N} = \frac{1}{2}$, the variance will change by only 6%. See the supplementary materials for more details. Under Fisher's null, the theoretical formula for the variance becomes computable from the observed data. Let $S := \sigma^2(Y)$ be the variance of all observed potential outcomes, and $S' := \sigma^2(Y')$ be the variance of all observed *aggregated* outcomes. Furthermore, $\overline{Y^2} := \overline{(Y_i^2)_{i \in G}}$ and $\overline{(Y')^2} := \overline{((Y'_j)^2)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}}$.

Theorem 2. *Under Fisher's null hypothesis of no treatment effect,*

$$var_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}[\Delta] = \lambda_1 \cdot \frac{n_{cr}}{n_{cr,t}n_{cr,c}} S + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr,t}m_{cbr,c}} S' + \lambda_2 \cdot \frac{n_{cr}}{n_{cr,t}n_{cr,c}} \left(\overline{Y^2} - \frac{m_{cr}m_{cbr}}{n_{cr}n_{cbr}} \overline{(Y')^2} \right)$$

A proof is included in the supplementary material. It is not always the case that assuming Fisher's null of no treatment effect is reasonable. Another approach which we can take is to compute an empirical approximation of the variance, which upper-bounds the true expectation. Note that the condition of Corollary 1 will be met only in expectation.

Theorem 3. *We consider the following variance estimator, computable from the observed data:*

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 := \frac{\hat{S}_{cr,t}}{n_{cr,t}} + \frac{\hat{S}_{cr,c}}{n_{cr,c}} + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{\hat{S}'_{cbr,t}}{m_{cbr,t}} + \frac{\hat{S}'_{cbr,c}}{m_{cbr,c}} \right) \quad (6)$$

If SUTVA holds, then the previous quantity upper-bounds the theoretical variance of the Δ estimator in expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}} [\hat{\sigma}^2] \geq \sigma^2.$$

Furthermore, in the case of a constant treatment effect, $\exists \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\forall i, Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) + \tau$, the above inequality becomes tight: $E_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}} [\hat{\sigma}^2] = \sigma^2$.

where we introduced the following empirical variance quantities in each treatment arm and treatment bucket: $\hat{S}_{cr,t} := \sigma^2(Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 1)$, $\hat{S}_{cr,c} := \sigma^2(Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge$

$Z_i = 0$), $\hat{S}'_{cbr,t} := \sigma^2(Y'_j : \omega_j = 0 \wedge z_j = 1)$, and $\hat{S}'_{cbr,c} := \sigma^2(Y'_j : \omega_j = 0 \wedge z_j = 0)$. A proof can be found in the supplementary material. In other words, the intuitive idea of summing the normalized variances of the potential outcomes in each treatment bucket of each treatment arm, results in an upper-bound in expectation of the variance of the difference-in-difference-in-mean estimator under our suggested hierarchical assignment. Due to its simplicity and lack of strong assumptions, we use the empirical upper-bound of Theorem 3 in our experiments.

3.3 Understanding the type II error rate

To paraphrase the result stated in Corollary 1, if we set our rejection region to $\{T \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\}$, then if $\hat{\sigma}^2 \geq \sigma^2$, the probability under the null of rejecting the null is lower than α . Computing and controlling the Type I error is straightforward because we can make the assumption that SUTVA holds. The same is not true of the type II error rate, where we must posit a model for the interference between units. We assume here a common linear model of interference and compute the resulting type II error of our test under this model. This linear model, sometimes referred to as the Distributional Interactions with Reference Groups (DIRG), assumes the following structure for the outcomes

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Z_i + \beta_2 \rho_i + \epsilon_i,$$

where $\rho_i = \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \sum_{j \in N(i)} Z_j$ is the average number of treated friends in unit i 's neighborhood and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\epsilon \perp \rho_i$.

We now provide some intuition as to what might happen when computing the Δ estimator under this model. Suppose that the graph clustering $\mathcal{J}$ is a perfect clustering (i.e cuts no edges of the graph), then the average treatment effect estimated in the completely randomized treatment arm is approximately β_1 and $\beta_1 + \beta_2$ in the cluster-based randomized treatment arm, such that $\Delta = \beta_2$ under a perfect clustering. Since there is interference only when $\beta_2 \neq 0$, the greater the interference the greater our chances of rejecting the null. In this sense, our test for interference is sensible. In fact, we can compute the expectation of the Δ estimator under any clustering, as given by the following theorem:

Theorem 4. *Fix a clustering C . Let $\rho := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} \frac{|N(i) \cap C(i)|}{|N(i)|}$ be the average fraction of a unit's neighbors contained in the cluster. Then,*

$$E[\Delta] = \left(\frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr} - 1} \left(\rho - \frac{1}{m_{cbr}} \right) - \frac{m_{cr}}{n_{cr}(n_{cr} - 1)} \right) \beta_2$$

A proof is included in the supplementary material. Note that when m_{cbr} and n_{cr} are large: $E[\Delta] \approx \rho \cdot \beta_2$. With the variance remaining the same, this results corroborates the intuitive idea that a clustering of the graph which cuts fewer edges of the graph will have a greater chance of rejecting the null under this model of interference.

Knowing the type II error rate can help us determine which clustering of the graph is most appropriate. The selection of hyper-parameters in clustering algorithms, including the number of clusters to set, can be informed by minimizing the type II error under plausible models of interference. The optimization program varies depending on the choice of variance estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{J}}^2$ for a clustering $\mathcal{J}$:

$$\max_{M, \mathcal{J}} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{J}}^2}},$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is composed of M *balanced* clusters. We discuss a reasonable heuristic in Section 4.2 to solving this optimization program, conjectured to be NP-hard. Further power analysis, such as exploring other parametrizations of interference and studying the impact on the variance of our estimators, is beyond the scope of the current paper.

3.4 Bernoulli randomization as an alternative assignment strategy

The completely randomized assignment is a well-understood assignment mechanism, which avoids degenerate cases where all units are assigned to treatment and control. However, experimentation platforms at major internet companies are rarely set up to run completely randomized experiments. Instead, these platforms run Bernoulli randomized (BR) assignments, which for large sample sizes, are intuitively equivalent to completely randomized assignments. We provide a formal explanation for why running a Bernoulli randomized assignment does not affect the validity of our test in practice: the variance of the difference-in-means estimator under the Bernoulli randomized mechanism and the completely randomized mechanism are equivalent up to $O(1/N^2)$ terms.

Theorem 5. *Let CR be the completely randomized assignment, assigning exactly N_{cr} units to treatment and $N_{cbr} := N - N_{cr}$ to control. Let BR be the re-randomized Bernoulli assignment, assigning units to treatment with probability $p := N_{cr}/N$ and to control with probability $1 - p = N_{cbr}/N$. For all $N \geq 2$ and for all $N_{cr} \in [1, N - 1]$ such that $p^N + (1 - p)^N \leq 1/N^2$, we have the following upper-bound:*

$$|var_{\mathbf{Z} \sim BR}[\hat{\tau}] - var_{\mathbf{Z} \sim CR}[\hat{\tau}]| \leq 5 \left(\frac{S_{cr}}{N_{cr}^2} + \frac{S_0}{N_{cbr}^2} \right)$$

A proof is included in the supplementary material. Note that we did not seek to optimize the constant term, which can be easily improved. For the analysis, we considered a re-randomized Bernoulli assignment scheme, which rejects assignments where all units are assigned to treatment ($\vec{Z} = \vec{0}$) or to control ($\vec{Z} = \vec{1}$).

4 Illustration on the LinkedIn experimentation platform

4.1 Experimental set-up

Today’s major Internet companies (e.g. Google (Tang et al., 2010), Microsoft, (Kohavi et al., 2013), Facebook (Bakshy et al., 2014), LinkedIn (Xu et al., 2015)) rely heavily on experimentation to understand the effect of each product decision, from minor UI changes to major product launches. Due to their extensive reliance on randomized experiments, these companies have each built mature experimentation platforms. It is an open question how many of the experiments run on these platforms violate SUTVA. By collaborating with the team in charge of LinkedIn’s experimentation platform, we were able to apply the previous theoretical framework to test for interference in one of LinkedIn’s many randomized experiments.

Users on LinkedIn can interact with content posted by their friends through a personalized feed. Rather than presenting the content chronologically, LinkedIn strives to improve a user’s feed by ranking content by relevance. In order to improve user experience, LinkedIn feed team continually suggests new feed ranking algorithms and seeks to determine the impact of each one on key user metrics through randomized experiments: time spent on the site, engagement with content on feed, original content creation etc. Experimentation on feed ranking algorithms is a typical case where interference between units is present. If a user receives a “good” treatment, they will interact more with the content on their feed which impact the feed of their connections. We seek to understand whether or not these network effects are negligible. To run the experiment, we (i) clustered the LinkedIn graph into balanced clusters (cf. Section 4.2) (ii) stratified the clusters by blocking on cluster covariates (cf. Section 4.3) (iii) assigned a set number of clusters to treatment and to control chosen at random, comprising the second treatment arm and treatment bucket assignment. Any unit not already assigned to treatment or control was given to the main experimentation pipeline: a sub-population of units is first (iv) sampled at random (cf. Section 2.3.2) and

then (v) assigned to treatment and control using a Bernoulli randomized assignment (cf. Section 3.4).

Before applying treatment to units assigned to treatment, we ran covariate balance checks and measured outcomes, and again 2 weeks after treatment was applied. The number of units per bucket and per treatment arm was in the order of several million.

4.2 Clustering the graph

The main challenge of implementing the proposed test for interference is clustering the graph into clusters of equal size. Due to the scale of the LinkedIn graph—millions of nodes and billions of edges—we considered only parallelizable streaming algorithms that explicitly enforce balance. We performed an extensive experimental evaluation of the state-of-the-art balanced clustering algorithms and found the restreaming version of the Linear Deterministic Greedy algorithm (reLDG) (Nishimura and Ugander, 2013) to work best. To cluster the full LinkedIn graph, we ran the parallel version of reLDG on 300 Hadoop nodes for 30 iterations. We set the number of clusters to $k = \{1000, 3000, 5000, 7000, 10000\}$ and a leniency of 1% for the balance constraint, to slightly sacrifice balance for better clustering quality. In the experiment, we used the clustering obtained by setting $k = 3000$ as it compromises between maximizing the fraction of edges within clusters (28.28%) and minimizing pre-treatment variance. See (Saveski et al., 2017) for more details.

4.3 Stratifying the clusters

As suggested in Section 2.3.1, we assigned each cluster to one of S strata in order to reduce variance of the estimator, and to ensure balance of cluster-level covariates. Each cluster is described by four covariates: number of edges within the cluster, number of edges with an endpoint in another cluster, and two metrics that characterize users’ engagement with the LinkedIn feed (averaged over all users in the cluster). We experimented with different stratification strategies (Saveski et al., 2017) and found stratification using balanced k-means clustering (Malinen and Fränti, 2014) to work best. We first ran balanced clustering to group the clusters into equally-sized strata and then sampled clusters from each stratum to place them in the different treatment arms and treatment buckets.

Statistic	Formula	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment
BR delta	$\sum_s \frac{m(s)}{M} \cdot \left(\overline{Y_{br,t}(s)} - \overline{Y_{br,c}(s)} \right)$	-0.0261	0.0432
CBR delta	$\sum_s \frac{m(s)}{M} \cdot \frac{m_{cbr}(s)}{n_{cbr}(s)} \cdot \left(\overline{Y'_{cbr,t}(s)} - \overline{Y'_{cbr,c}(s)} \right)$	0.0638	0.1653
Delta of Deltas	$\sum_s \frac{m(s)}{M} \cdot \Delta(s)$	-0.0899	-0.1221
Upp. bound of BR std	$\sqrt{\sum_s \left(\frac{m(s)}{M} \right)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\hat{S}_{br,t}(s)}{n_{br,t}(s)} + \frac{\hat{S}_{br,c}(s)}{n_{br,c}(s)} \right)}$	0.0096	0.0098
Upp. bound of CBR std	$\sqrt{\sum_s \left(\frac{m(s)}{M} \right)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{m_{cbr}(s)}{n_{cbr}(s)} \right)^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\hat{S}_{cbr,t}(s)}{m_{cbr,t}(s)} + \frac{\hat{S}_{cbr,c}(s)}{m_{cbr,c}(s)} \right)}$	0.0805	0.0848
Upp. bound of std	$\sqrt{\sum_s \left(\frac{m(s)}{M} \right)^2 \cdot \hat{\sigma}^2(s)}$	0.0811	0.0856
Test statistic		-0.0111	-0.0143
2-tailed p-value		0.2670	0.1530

Table 1: Results of experiments on subset of the LinkedIn graph. BR, Bernoulli randomized; CBR, cluster-based randomized. The final row displays the two-tailed p-value of the test statistic T under assumption of normality $T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Outcomes have been multiplied by a constant to avoid disclosing raw numbers.

4.4 Experimental results

We implemented our experimental design on the LinkedIn experimental platform, in August 2016. We considered a subset of the LinkedIn graph, containing several million users. The primary outcome variables of interest is related to a user’s engagement with their LinkedIn feed. We measured this outcome prior to launching the experiment and 2 weeks after treatment was applied. These results are reported in Table 1. The experiment failed to reject the null. To reject at 5% (resp. 10%) using Corollary 1, the rejection zone is $\{T \geq 4.47\}$ (resp. $\{T \geq 3.36\}$) which we did not come close to. However, under the assumption that our test statistic is normally distributed, the post-treatment test statistic for the outcome variable measuring the levels of engagement with the feed decreased. In general, the treatment effect within each arm was not as significant as expected. With roughly 2/3 of edges cut, and a pre-treatment variance upper-bound equal to .08, we would have needed an interference parameter value $\beta_2 = 0.48$ to achieve statistical significance at 5% under the DIRG model of outcomes (cf. Theorem 4). Yet, under the DIRG model of interference, an easy upper-bound for β_2 is 0.17 from Table 1. A more disruptive product launch, with a greater treatment effect, might be better able to identify interference effects on the LinkedIn experimentation platform. Furthermore, the majority of the variance came from the cluster-based randomized arm which was expected. A better clustering method which minimizes edges cut *and* focuses on minimizing the pre-treatment variance might lead to a statistically significant result.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank Guillaume Basse and Dean Eckles for useful comments and discussions.

This research was sponsored, in part, by National science Foundation awards CAREER IIS-1149662 and IIS-1409177, and by Office of Naval Research awards YIP N00014-14-1-0485 and N00014-17-1-2131.

References

Aral, S. and Walker, D. (2011). Creating social contagion through viral product design: A randomized trial of peer influence in networks. *Management science*, 57(9):1623–1639.

- Aronow, P. M. (2012). A general method for detecting interference between units in randomized experiments. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 41(1):3–16.
- Aronow, P. M., Middleton, J. A., et al. (2013). A class of unbiased estimators of the average treatment effect in randomized experiments. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 1(1):135–154.
- Aronow, P. M. and Samii, C. (2013). Estimating average causal effects under interference between units. *arXiv:1305.6156*.
- Athey, S., Eckles, D., and Imbens, G. W. (2015). Exact p-values for network interference. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Backstrom, L. and Kleinberg, J. (2011). Network bucket testing. In *WWW*, pages 615–624.
- Bakshy, E., Eckles, D., and Bernstein, M. S. (2014). Designing and deploying online field experiments. In *WWW*, pages 283–292.
- Basse, G. W. and Airolidi, E. M. (2015). Optimal design of experiments in the presence of network-correlated outcomes. *arXiv:1507.00803*.
- Chao, M.-T. and Strawderman, W. (1972). Negative moments of positive random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 67(338):429–431.
- Choi, D. S. (2014). Estimation of monotone treatment effects in network experiments. *arXiv:1408.4102*.
- COMMIT (1991). Community intervention trial for smoking cessation (commit): summary of design and intervention. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 83(22):1620–1628.
- Cornfield, J. (1978). Symposium on chd prevention trials: Design issues in testing life style intervention randomization by group: A formal analysis. *American journal of epidemiology*, 108(2):100–102.
- Cox, D. R. (1958). *Planning of experiments*. Wiley.
- Datta, S., Halloran, M. E., and Longini, I. M. (1999). Efficiency of estimating vaccine efficacy for susceptibility and infectiousness: randomization by individual versus household. *Biometrics*, 55(3):792–798.
- Donner, A. and Klar, N. (2004). Pitfalls of and controversies in cluster randomization trials. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(3):416–422.

- Eckles, D., Karrer, B., and Ugander, J. (2014). Design and analysis of experiments in networks: Reducing bias from interference. *arXiv:1404.7530*.
- Eckles, D., Kizilcec, R. F., and Bakshy, E. (2016). Estimating peer effects in networks with peer encouragement designs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7316–7322.
- Gui, H., Xu, Y., Bhasin, A., and Han, J. (2015). Network a/b testing: From sampling to estimation. In *WWW*, pages 399–409.
- Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1251–1271.
- Hong, G. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2012). Evaluating kindergarten retention policy. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- Hudgens, M. G. and Halloran, M. E. (2008). Toward causal inference with interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 832–842.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Karwa, V. and Airolidi, E. M. (2017). Estimating average treatment effects in the presence of network interference: Modes of failure and solutions. arXiv no. 0417.xxxx.
- Katzir, L., Liberty, E., and Somekh, O. (2012). Framework and algorithms for network bucket testing. In *WWW*, pages 1029–1036.
- Kohavi, R., Deng, A., Frasca, B., Walker, T., Xu, Y., and Pohlmann, N. (2013). Online controlled experiments at large scale. In *KDD*, pages 1168–1176.
- Malinen, M. I. and Fränti, P. (2014). Balanced k-means for clustering. In *Joint IAPR International Workshops on Statistical Techniques in Pattern Recognition (SPR) and Structural and Syntactic Pattern Recognition (SSPR)*, pages 32–41. Springer.
- Manski, C. F. (2013). Identification of treatment response with social interactions. *The Econometrics Journal*, 16(1):S1–S23.
- Nishimura, J. and Ugander, J. (2013). Restreaming graph partitioning: simple versatile algorithms for advanced balancing. In *KDD*, pages 1106–1114.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2007). Interference between units in randomized experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477).

- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 66(5):688.
- Rubin, D. B. (1990). Formal mode of statistical inference for causal effects. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 25(3):279–292.
- Saveski, M., Pouget-Abadie, J., Saint-Jacques, G., Duan, W., Ghosh, S., Xu, Y., and Airolidi, E. (2017). Detecting network effects: Randomizing over randomized experiments. *In submission*. See jean.pouget-abadie.com/experimental.pdf.
- Shakya, H., Stafford, D., Hughes, D., Keegan, T., Negron, R., Broome, J., McKnight, M., Nicoll, L., Nelson, J., Iriarte, E., Ferrera, M., Airolidi, E. M., Fowler, J., and Christakis, N. A. (2017). Exploiting social influence to magnify population-level behavior change in maternal and child health: Study protocol for a randomized controlled trial of network targeting algorithms in rural Honduras. *BMJ Open*, page e012996.
- Sinclair, B., McConnell, M., and Green, D. P. (2012). Detecting spillover effects: Design and analysis of multilevel experiments. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(4):1055–1069.
- Sussman, D. L. and Airolidi, E. M. (2017). Elements of estimation theory for causal effects in the presence of network interference. arXiv no. 1702.03578.
- Tang, D., Agarwal, A., O’Brien, D., and Meyer, M. (2010). Overlapping experiment infrastructure: More, better, faster experimentation. In *KDD*, pages 17–26.
- Tchetgen, E. J. T. and VanderWeele, T. J. (2012). On causal inference in the presence of interference. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 21(1):55–75.
- Toulis, P. and Kao, E. (2013). Estimation of Causal Peer Influence Effects. In *ICML*.
- Ugander, J., Karrer, B., Backstrom, L., and Kleinberg, J. (2013). Graph cluster randomization: Network exposure to multiple universes. In *KDD*, pages 329–337.
- Xu, Y., Chen, N., Fernandez, A., Sinno, O., and Bhasin, A. (2015). From infrastructure to culture: A/b testing challenges in large scale social networks. In *KDD*, pages 2227–2236.

A Supplementary material

The following section includes a proof of Theorems 1–5, a proof of Corollary 1, and a proof of Equation 5. Recall that for a vector $\vec{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{br}$ and $\sigma^2(\mu) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i - \bar{\mu})^2$.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Recall that m_{br} and n_{br} are the number of clusters and units respectively in treatment arm br ($W_i = 1$), that m_{cbr} and n_{cbr} are the number of clusters and units respectively in treatment arm cbr ($W_i = 0$) and that $M = m_{br} + m_{cbr}$ and $N = n_{br} + n_{cbr}$. Since the clustering of the graph is balanced, we have $\frac{m_{br}}{n_{br}} = \frac{M}{N} = \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}}$. If SUTVA holds, $Y_i(\vec{Z}) = Y_i(Z_i)$, such that

$$E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}|W] = \frac{1}{n_{br}} \sum_{i \in G} W_i(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)) - \frac{1}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i)(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)).$$

As a result, under SUTVA,

$$E_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = 0$$

We now compute the theoretical variance of the Δ estimator. By Eve's law, we have:

$$\text{var}_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}) = E_{\mathbf{W}}[\text{var}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mu}_{br}|W)] + E_W[\text{var}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mu}_{cbr}|W)] + \text{var}[E[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}|W]]$$

We compute each term separately, where we introduce $S_{br}(1) := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) : W_i = 1)$, $S_{br}(0) := \sigma^2(Y_i(0) : W_i = 1)$ and $S_{br}(1, 0) := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) : W_i = 1)$. Furthermore, we let $S'_{cbr}(1) := \sigma^2(Y'_j(1) : \omega_j = 0)$, $S'_{cbr}(0) := \sigma^2(Y'_j(0) : \omega_j = 0)$ and $S_{cbr}(1, 0) := \sigma^2(Y_j(1) - Y_j(0) : \omega_j = 0)$. Recall that $n_{br,t}$ and $n_{br,c}$ are the number of treated and control units in treatment arm br and $n_{cbr,t}$ and $n_{cbr,c}$ are the number of treated and control units in treatment arm cbr . Conditioned on the assignment of units to treatment arms, it is a classical result of causal inference that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br}|W] &= \frac{1}{n_{br,t}} S_{br}(1) + \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} S_{br}(0) - \frac{1}{n_{br}} S_{br}(1, 0) \\ \text{var}_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{cbr}|W] &= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \left(\frac{1}{n_{cbr,t}} S_{cbr}(1) + \frac{1}{n_{cbr,c}} S_{cbr}(0) - \frac{1}{m_{cbr}} S_{cbr}(1, 0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By linearity of expectation, we now compute the expectation of each term with respect to $\mathbf{W}$.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(1)] &= \frac{1}{n_{br} - 1} \sum_{i \in G} E_{\mathbf{W}}[W_i \left(Y_i(1) - \overline{Y_{br}(1)} \right)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br} - 1} \sum_{i \in G} E[W_i] Y_i^2(1) - \frac{n_1}{n_{br} - 1} E \left[\left(\overline{Y_{br}(1)} \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The expectation of the first term is given by

$$\frac{1}{n_{br} - 1} \sum_{i \in G} E[W_i] Y_i^2(1) = \frac{1}{n_{br} - 1} \sum_{i \in G} \frac{m_{br}}{M} Y_i^2(1) = \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{N}{n_{br} - 1} \overline{Y^2(1)} = \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br} - 1} \overline{Y^2(1)}.$$

We now compute the second term. Note that $E[W_i W_j] = \frac{m_{br}}{M}$ if i and j belong to the same cluster and $E[W_i W_j] = \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1}$ otherwise. In particular, $E[W_i^2] = \frac{m_{br}}{M}$.

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left(\overline{Y_{br}(1)} \right)^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in G} E[W_i W_j] Y_i(1) Y_j(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(i)} \frac{m_{br}}{M} Y_i(1) Y_j(1) + \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{J}(i)} \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} Y_i(1) Y_j(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \left(\frac{m_{br}}{M} - \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} \right) \sum_{i \in G} Y_i(1) Y'_{\mathcal{J}(i)}(1) + \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} \sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in G} Y_i(1) Y_j(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br} m_{cbr}}{M(M - 1)} \sum_{i \in G} Y_i(1) Y'_{\mathcal{J}(i)}(1) + \frac{N^2}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br} m_{cbr}}{M(M - 1)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in j} Y_i(1) Y_j(1) + \frac{N}{n_{br}} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br} m_{cbr}}{M - 1} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} + \frac{N}{n_{br}} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Another way to obtain this result is to notice that $\overline{Y_{br}(1)} = \frac{m_{br}}{n_{br}} \overline{Y'_{br}(1)}$ and $\overline{Y(1)} = \frac{m_{br}}{n_{br}} \overline{Y'(1)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left(\overline{Y_{br}(1)} \right)^2 \right] &= \frac{m_{br}^2}{n_{br}^2} \left(\frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{br}(M - 1)} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} + \frac{M(m_{br} - 1)}{m_{br}(M - 1)} \left(\overline{Y'(1)} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{m_{br}^2}{n_{br}^2} \left(\frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{br}(M - 1)} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} + \frac{M(m_{br} - 1)}{m_{br}(M - 1)} \frac{n_{br}^2}{m_{br}^2} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br} m_{cbr}}{M - 1} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} + \frac{N}{n_{br}} \frac{m_{br} - 1}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Putting the two terms together, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[S_{br}(1)] &= \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br}-1} \overline{Y^2(1)} - \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br}-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_{br}^2} \frac{m_{br}m_{cbr}}{M-1} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} + \frac{N}{n_{br}} \frac{m_{br}-1}{M-1} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br}-1} \overline{Y^2(1)} - \frac{N}{n_{br}-1} \frac{m_{br}-1}{M-1} \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{n_{br}(n_{br}-1)} \frac{m_{br}m_{cbr}}{M-1} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{br}-1} \frac{1}{M-1} \left(n_{br}(M-1) \overline{Y^2(1)} - N(m_{br}-1) \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 - \frac{m_{br}m_{cbr}}{n_{br}} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{br}-1} \frac{1}{M-1} \left(n_{br}M \left(\overline{Y^2(1)} - \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \right) - N \left(\overline{Y^2(1)} - \left(\overline{Y(1)} \right)^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + n_{cbr} \overline{Y^2(1)} - \frac{m_{br}m_{cbr}}{n_{br}} \overline{(Y')^2(1)} \right) \\
&= \frac{N-1}{N} \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br}-1} \frac{M}{M-1} S_1 + \frac{n_{br}n_{cbr} \overline{Y^2(1)} - m_{br}m_{cbr} \overline{(Y')^2(1)}}{n_{br}(n_{br}-1)(M-1)} \quad \text{where } S_1 := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) : i \in G)
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain an identical expression for $E[S_{br}(0)]$:

$$E[S_{br}(0)] = \frac{N-1}{N} \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br}-1} \frac{M}{M-1} S_0 + \frac{n_{br}n_{cbr} \overline{Y^2(0)} - m_{br}m_{cbr} \overline{(Y')^2(0)}}{n_{br}(n_{br}-1)(M-1)} \quad \text{where } S_0 := \sigma^2(Y_i(0) : i \in G)$$

Furthermore, letting $S_{10} := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) : i \in G)$:

$$E[S_{br}(10)] = \frac{N-1}{N} \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br}-1} \frac{M}{M-1} S_{10} + \frac{n_{br}n_{cbr} \overline{(Y(1) - Y(0))^2} - m_{br}m_{cbr} \overline{(Y'(1) - Y'(0))^2}}{n_{br}(n_{br}-1)(M-1)}$$

We follow the same reasoning for the second cluster-based estimator:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[S_{cbr}(1)] &= \frac{1}{m_{cbr}-1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} E[\omega_j] (Y'_j(1))^2 - \frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr}-1} E \left[\overline{Y'_2(1)} \right]^2 \\
&= \frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr}-1} \overline{Y'(1)^2} - \frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr}-1} E \left[\left(\overline{Y'_{cbr}(1)} \right)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

We now compute the second term:

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\left(\overline{Y'_{cbr}(1)} \right)^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{m_{cbr}^2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}} E[\omega_j \omega_k] Y'_j(1) Y'_k(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{m_{cbr}^2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} E \left[d_j^2 + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{M^2} \right] (Y'_j(1))^2 + \frac{1}{m_{cbr}^2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{k \neq j} E \left[d_j d_k + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{M^2} \right] Y'_j(1) Y'_k(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{m_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{m_{cbr}(M - m_{cbr})}{M^2} + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{M^2} \right) \cdot M \cdot \overline{(Y'(1))^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{m_{cbr}^2} \left(-\frac{m_{cbr}(M - m_{cbr})}{M^2(M - 1)} + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{M^2} \right) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{k \neq j} Y_j(1) Y_k(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{m_{cbr}} \cdot \overline{(Y'(1))^2} + \frac{1}{m_{cbr}^2} \frac{m_{cbr}}{M^2} \frac{M(m_{cbr} - 1)}{M - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{k \neq j} Y_j(1) Y_k(1) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{m_{cbr}} - M \cdot \frac{m_{cbr} - 1}{m_{cbr} M (M - 1)} \right) \overline{(Y'(1))^2} + \frac{m_{cbr} - 1}{m_{cbr} M (M - 1)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}} Y'_j(1) Y'_k(1) \\
&= \frac{m_{br}}{m_{cbr}(M - 1)} \overline{(Y'(1))^2} + \frac{M(m_{cbr} - 1)}{m_{cbr}(M - 1)} \left(\overline{Y'(1)} \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Putting both terms together, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
E[S_{cbr}(1)] &= \left(\frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr} - 1} - \frac{m_{br}}{(m_{cbr} - 1)(M - 1)} \right) \overline{(Y'(1))^2} - \frac{M}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y'(1)} \right)^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr} - 1} - \frac{m_{br}}{(m_{cbr} - 1)(M - 1)} \right) \overline{(Y'(1))^2} - \frac{M}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y'(1)} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{M}{M - 1} \overline{(Y'(1))^2} - \frac{M}{M - 1} \left(\overline{Y'(1)} \right)^2 \\
&= S'_1 := \sigma^2(Y'_j(1) : j \in \mathcal{J})
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $E[S_{cbr}(0)] = S'_0$ and $E[S_{cbr}(1, 0)] = S'_{10}$. We have that:

$$E[\text{var}(\hat{\mu}_{cbr}|W)] = \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{S'_1}{m_{cbr,t}} + \frac{S'_0}{m_{cbr,c}} - \frac{S'_{10}}{m_{cbr}} \right)$$

Finally, we must compute $\text{var}[E[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr} | W]]$. We define $Y_i^+ = \frac{M^2}{m_{br}m_{cbr}}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))$ and $D_i = W_i - \frac{m_{br}}{M}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{var}_{\mathbf{W}}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr} | \mathbf{W}]] &= \text{var} \left[\frac{1}{n_{br}} \sum_{i \in G} W_i (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)) - \frac{1}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)) \right] \\
&= \text{var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} \left(W_i - \frac{m_{br}}{M} \right) \left(\frac{M}{m_{br}} + \frac{M}{m_{cbr}} \right) (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)) \right] \\
&= \text{var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} D_i Y_i^+ \right] \\
&= \frac{M^2}{N^2} \text{var} \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} d_j Y_j'^+ \right] \\
&= \frac{M^2}{N^2} \frac{m_{br}m_{cbr}}{M^3(M-1)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \left(Y_j'^+(1) - Y_j'^+(0) - (\overline{Y'^+(1)} - \overline{Y'^+(0)}) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{M^2}{N^2} \frac{m_{br}m_{cbr}}{M^3(M-1)} \frac{M^4}{m_{br}^2 m_{cbr}^2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \left(Y^{(j)}(1) - Y^{(j)}(0) - (\overline{Y'(1)} - \overline{Y'(0)}) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{M}{n_{br}n_{cbr}} S'_{10} \quad \text{where } S'_{10} = \sigma^2 (Y^{(j)}(1) - Y^{(j)}(0) : j \in \mathcal{J})
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes our proof of Theorem 1.

A.2 Proof of Corollary 1

Under SUTVA, the test statistic $T := \frac{\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr}}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}^2}}$ is a random variable with mean 0 and variance smaller than 1 if $\hat{\sigma}^2 \geq \sigma^2$. Chebyshev's inequality implies:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{P}(|T| \geq t) \leq \frac{1}{t^2}$$

It follows that, if SUTVA holds, and we reject with $\{|T| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\}$, then we reject with probability less than α .

A.3 Proof of Equation 5

Under no treatment effect: $\text{var}_0 = \frac{S}{N_t} + \frac{S}{N_c} = \frac{N}{N_t N_c} S$, whilst the true variance becomes $\text{var}_1 = (1+\rho)^2 \frac{S_c}{N_t} + \frac{\sigma^2}{N_t}$. Indeed, $S_{tc} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\epsilon_i - \bar{\epsilon})^2 = \text{var}[\epsilon] = \sigma^2$ and $S_t = (1+\rho)^2 S_c + \sigma^2$.

It follows that

$$\frac{\text{var}_1 - \text{var}_0}{\text{var}_0} = \frac{\frac{(2\rho + \rho^2)S}{N_t} + \left(\frac{1}{N_t} - \frac{1}{N}\right)\sigma^2}{S \frac{N}{N_c N_t}} = (2\rho + \rho^2) \frac{N_c}{N} + \frac{\sigma^2}{S} \left(\frac{N_c}{N}\right)^2.$$

A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

Under Fisher's null, $\forall i, Y_i(1) = Y_i(0)$. From Theorem 1, we obtain by simple substitution:

$$\text{var}_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}}[\Delta] = \lambda_1 \cdot \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br,t} n_{br,c}} S + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \frac{m_{cbr}}{m_{cbr,t} m_{cbr,c}} S' + \lambda_{cbr} \cdot \frac{n_{br}}{n_{br,t} n_{br,c}} \left(\overline{Y^2} - \frac{m_{br} m_{cbr}}{n_{br} n_{cbr}} \overline{(Y')^2} \right)$$

where $\sigma^2(Y)$ is the variance of all observed potential outcomes, $S' := \sigma^2(Y')$ is the variance of all observed *aggregated* outcomes. Furthermore, $\overline{Y^2} := \overline{(Y_i^2)_{i \in G}}$ and $\overline{(Y')^2} := \overline{((Y'_j)^2)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}}$

A.5 Proof of Theorem 3

Recall the notation introduced in the proof of Theorem 1. We let $S_{br}(1) := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) : W_i = 1)$, $S_{br}(0) := \sigma^2(Y_i(0) : W_i = 1)$ and $S_{br}(10) := \sigma^2(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) : W_i = 1)$. Furthermore, we let $S'_{cbr}(1) := \sigma^2(Y'_j(1) : \omega_j = 0)$, $S'_{cbr}(0) := \sigma^2(Y'_j(0) : \omega_j = 0)$ and $S'_{cbr}(10) := \sigma^2(Y'_j(1) - Y'_j(0) : \omega_j = 0)$. Let us rewrite the formula for the theoretical variance using this notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 = & \frac{1}{n_{br,t}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(1)] + \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(0)] - \frac{1}{n_{br}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(10)] \\ & + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{1}{m_{cbr,t}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{cbr}(1)] + \frac{1}{m_{cbr,c}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S'_{cbr}(0)] - \frac{1}{m_{cbr}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S'_{cbr}(10)] \right) + \text{var}[E_{\mathbf{W}}[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr} | \mathbf{W}]] \end{aligned}$$

We begin by noting that $E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(10)] \geq 0$. Furthermore, we have the following equalities from the previous proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}[E_{\mathbf{W}}[\hat{\mu}_{br} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr} | \mathbf{W}]] &= \frac{M}{n_{br} n_{cbr}} S'_{10} \\ E_{\mathbf{W}}[S'_{cbr}(10)] &= S'_{10} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to observe that:

$$\left(-\frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \frac{1}{m_{cbr}} + \frac{M}{n_{br} n_{cbr}} \right) S'_{10} < 0$$

Thus, it follows that:

$$\sigma^2 \leq \frac{1}{n_{br,t}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(1)] + \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S_{br}(0)] + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{1}{m_{cbr,t}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S'_{cbr}(1)] + \frac{1}{m_{cbr,c}} E_{\mathbf{W}}[S'_{cbr}(0)] \right) \quad (7)$$

We introduce the following notation: $\hat{S}_{br,t} := \sigma^2(Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 1)$, $\hat{S}_{br,c} := \sigma^2(Y_i : W_i = 1 \wedge Z_i = 0)$, $\hat{S}_{cbr,t} := \sigma^2(Y_i : W_i = 0 \wedge Z_i = 1)$, $\hat{S}_{cbr,c} := \sigma^2(Y_i : W_i = 0 \wedge Z_i = 0)$. Let us consider the following empirical quantity:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 := \frac{\hat{S}_{br,t}}{n_{br,t}} + \frac{\hat{S}_{br,c}}{n_{br,c}} + \frac{m_{cbr}^2}{n_{cbr}^2} \left(\frac{\hat{S}'_{cbr,t}}{m_{cbr,t}} + \frac{\hat{S}'_{cbr,c}}{m_{cbr,c}} \right)$$

Note that $E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{S}_{br,t}|\mathbf{W}] = S_{br}(1)$, $E_Z[\hat{S}_{br,c}|\mathbf{W}] = S_{br}(0)$, $E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{S}'_{cbr,t}|\mathbf{W}] = S'_{cbr}(1)$, $E_Z[\hat{S}'_{cbr,c}|\mathbf{W}] = S'_{cbr}(0)$. As a result, $E[\hat{\sigma}^2] \geq \sigma^2$.

A.6 Proof of Theorem 4

This is the proof of the lemma in the power consideration section. We first decompose Δ as a sum of three differences:

$$\Delta = (\hat{\mu}_{br,0} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr,0}) + (\hat{\mu}_{br,1} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr,1}) + (\hat{\mu}_{br,2} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr,2})$$

which are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{br,0} &:= \sum_{i \in G} W_i (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{n_{br,t}} \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_i) \\ \hat{\mu}_{br,1} &:= \sum_{i \in G} W_i (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{n_{br,t}} \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} \beta_1 Z_i \\ \hat{\mu}_{br,2} &:= \sum_{i \in G} W_i (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{n_{br,t}} \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} \beta_2 \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \sum_{j \in N(i)} Z_j \\ \hat{\mu}_{cbr,0} &:= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,t}} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,c}} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_i) \\ \hat{\mu}_{cbr,1} &:= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,t}} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,c}} \beta_1 Z_i \\ \hat{\mu}_{cbr,2} &:= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,t}} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,c}} \beta_2 \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \sum_{j \in N(i)} Z_j \end{aligned}$$

We must now compute the expectation of each term with respect to $\{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}\}$. For the first difference, we first compute the expectation w.r.t to ϵ , which cancels out.

$$E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br,0}|\mathbf{W}] = \beta_0 \sum_{i \in G} W_i \left(\frac{1}{n_{br,t}} \cdot \frac{n_{br,t}}{n_{br}} - \frac{1}{n_{br,c}} \cdot \frac{n_{br,c}}{n_{br}} \right) = 0$$

The same goes for $E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{cbr,0}|\mathbf{W}]$ and therefore $E_{\mathbf{W},\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br,0} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr,0}] = 0$. We now compute the second difference.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{Z}}[E[\hat{\mu}_{br,1}|\mathbf{W}]] &= \sum_{i \in G} E[W_i] \left(\frac{\beta_1}{n_{br,t}} \cdot \frac{n_{br,t}}{n_{br}} \right) = \sum_{i \in G} \frac{m_{br}}{M} \frac{\beta_1}{n_{br}} = \beta_1 \\ E[E[\hat{\mu}_{cbr,1}|\mathbf{W}]] &= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} E[(1 - W_i)] \left(\frac{\beta_1}{m_{cbr,t}} \cdot \frac{m_{cbr,t}}{m_{cbr}} \right) = \beta_1 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $E_{\mathbf{W},\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br,1} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr,1}] = 0$. We compute the expectation of the last difference.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br,2}|\mathbf{W}] &= \beta_2 \sum_{i \in G} W_i \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \sum_{j \in N(i)} E_Z \left[Z_j (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{n_{br,t}^{Z_i}} \frac{1}{n_{br,c}^{1-Z_i}} \middle| W \right] \\ &= \beta_2 \sum_{i \in G} W_i \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \sum_{j \in N(i)} \frac{-1}{n_{br}(n_{br} - 1)} \\ &= \frac{-\beta_2}{n_{br}(n_{br} - 1)} \sum_{i \in G} W_i \\ &= -\frac{m_{br}}{n_{br}(n_{br} - 1)} \beta_2 \end{aligned}$$

We now compute the expectation under the second arm:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{cbr,2}|\mathbf{W}] &= \beta_2 \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \sum_{j \in N(i)} E_Z \left[Z_j (-1)^{1-Z_i} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,t}^{Z_i}} \frac{1}{m_{cbr,c}^{1-Z_i}} \middle| W \right] \\ &= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \beta_2 \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) \frac{1}{|N(i)|} \left(\sum_{j \in N(i) \cap C(i)} \frac{1}{m_{cbr}} + \sum_{j \in N(i) \setminus C(i)} \frac{-1}{m_{cbr}(m_{cbr} - 1)} \right) \\ &= \frac{m_{cbr}}{n_{cbr}} \beta_2 \sum_{i \in G} (1 - W_i) \left(\frac{1}{m_{cbr}} \frac{|N(i) \cap C(i)|}{|N(i)|} - \frac{1}{m_{cbr}(m_{cbr} - 1)} \frac{|N(i) \setminus C(i)|}{|N(i)|} \right) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

$$E_{\mathbf{W},\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mu}_{br,2} - \hat{\mu}_{cbr,2}] = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} \frac{|N(i) \cap C(i)|}{|N(i)|} - \frac{1}{N(m_{cbr} - 1)} \sum_{i \in G} \frac{|N(i) \setminus C(i)|}{|N(i)|} - \frac{m_{br}}{n_{br}(n_{br} - 1)} \right) \beta_2$$

If, for any clustering C , we let $\rho_C := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} \frac{|N(i) \cap C(i)|}{|N(i)|}$ and $\rho'_C := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in G} \frac{|N(i) \setminus C(i)|}{|N(i)|}$ be the average fraction of a node's neighbors contained in the cluster and not contained in the cluster respectively, then

$$E_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}}[\Delta] = \left(\rho_C - \frac{\rho'_C}{m_{cbr} - 1} - \frac{m_{br}}{n_{br}(n_{br} - 1)} \right) \beta_2$$

A.7 Proof of Theorem 5

We compare the variance of the difference-in-means estimator under the CR assignment to its variance under a Bernoulli Randomized (BR) assignment. In order to avoid situations where no units are assigned to treatment or control, we condition on the event that at least one unit is assigned to treatment and control. In other words, BR denotes the *re-randomized* Bernoulli assignment strategy, which rejects the edge cases where all units are assigned to treatment or control. Let N_t be the *realized* number of units assigned to treatment under the BR assignment, and N_1 be the desired number of units assigned to treatment under the CR assignment. Naturally, $E[N_t] = N_1$. Let $p := \frac{N_1}{N}$, where N is the total number of units. Under the BR assignment, using Eve's law, we have the following:

$$\text{var}_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\tau}] = \text{var}_{N_t} [E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\tau}|N_t]] + E_{N_t} [\text{var}_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\tau}|N_t]] \quad (8)$$

We now examine the first term of Equation 8:

$$E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\tau}|N_t] = \frac{1}{N_t} \sum_i E_{\mathbf{Z}}[Z_i|N_t]Y_i(1) - \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_i E_{\mathbf{Z}}[1 - Z_i|N_t]Y_i(0)$$

Note that:

$$E_{\mathbf{Z}}[Z_i|N_t] = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = 1, N_t)}{\mathbb{P}(N_t)} = \frac{\binom{N-1}{N_t-1} p^{N_t} (1-p)^{(N-1)-(N_t-1)}}{\binom{N}{N_t} p^{N_t} (1-p)^{N-N_t}} = \frac{N_t}{N}$$

Similarly, $E_{\mathbf{Z}}[1 - Z_i|N_t] = \frac{N_c}{N}$. As a result, $E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\tau}|N_t] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$. And thus,

$$\text{var}_{N_t} [E_{\mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\tau}|N_t]] = 0$$

We now examine the second term of Eq. 8:

$$E_{N_t} \left[\frac{S_1}{N_t} + \frac{S_0}{N_c} - \frac{S_{10}}{N} \right] = S_1 E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] + S_0 E_{N_c} \left[\frac{1}{N_c} \right] - \frac{S_{10}}{N}$$

We need to compute $E \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right]$. We rely on the following crude-upper bound given by Lemma 1, proved in the following section:

Lemma 1. *If $p^n + (1 - p)^n \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, we have the crude upper-bound:*

$$\left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{N_1} \right| \leq \frac{5}{(np)^2}$$

It follows therefore that:

$$\forall n \geq 2, \forall p \in (0, 1), \quad |\text{var}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim BR}[\hat{\tau}] - \text{var}_{\mathbf{Z} \sim CR}[\hat{\tau}]| \leq 5 \left(\frac{S_1}{N_1^2} + \frac{S_0}{N_{cbr}^2} \right)$$

A.8 Proof of Lemma 1

If X is a binomial of parameters $B(n, p)$, let $p_k := \mathbb{P}(X = k)$ and let $\alpha := p^n + (1 - p)^n$. It is easy to show that:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in [1, n-1], \quad \mathbb{P}(N_t = k) &= \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(i^{\text{th}} \text{ throw} = k | \text{first } i-1 \text{ throws} = 0 \text{ or } 1) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} p_k \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (p^n + (1-p)^n) \\ &= p_k \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} (p^n + (1-p)^n)^i \\ &= \frac{p_k}{1 - p^n - (1-p)^n} \\ &= \frac{p_k}{1 - \alpha} \end{aligned}$$

As expected N_t behaves *almost* like a binomial distribution when $n \rightarrow +\infty$. There is a known closed form formula for the first negative moment of a binomial distribution from [Chao and Strawderman \(1972\)](#). For a binomial X of parameters (n, p) ,

$$E_X \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right] = \frac{1}{p(n+1)} (1 - (1-p)^{n+1})$$

Let $X \sim B(n, p)$:

$$\left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{N_1} \right| = \left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} E \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right] \right| + \left| \frac{1}{1-\alpha} E \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right] - \frac{1}{N_1} \right|$$

We study the second term:

$$\left| \frac{1}{1-\alpha} E \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right] - \frac{1}{N_1} \right| = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{N_1+p} - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{(1-p)^{n+1}}{N_1+p} \leq \frac{p^n}{(1-\alpha)n}$$

We now study the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} E \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right] \right| &= \left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} E_X \left[\frac{1}{1+X} \right] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{p_k}{k} - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{p_k}{k+1} \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{p_k}{k(k+1)} + \frac{p^n}{n+1} + (1-p)^n \right) \end{aligned}$$

We find a crude $O(\frac{1}{n^2})$ -upper-bound of the summation term:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{p_k}{k(k+1)} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{3}{(k+1)(k+2)} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \\ &= \frac{3}{(n+1)(n+2)} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n+2}{k+2} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \\ &= \frac{3}{p^2(n+1)(n+2)} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n+2}{k+2} p^{k+2} (1-p)^{n-k} \\ &= \frac{3}{p^2(n+1)(n+2)} \sum_{k=3}^{n+1} \binom{n+2}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n+2-k} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{p^2(n+1)(n+2)} \leq \frac{3}{(np)^2} \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{N_1} \right| \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{3}{(np)^2} + \frac{p^n}{n+1} + (1-p)^n + \frac{p^n}{n} \right)$$

If $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{4}$, we can find a crude upper-bound of the RHS term:

$$\left| E_{N_t} \left[\frac{1}{N_t} \right] - \frac{1}{N_1} \right| \leq \frac{5}{(np)^2}$$